

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Meeting Summary  
Solid Waste Master Plan Review  
October 20, 2004**

This was the second of three SWAC meetings scheduled to solicit input and recommendations from the group regarding the review and revision of the *Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan* (SWMP). John Fischer continued the group discussion from the last meeting by reviewing summary points from the October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting and gathering additional input on both waste management capacity issues and waste reduction strategies.

**Background Assumptions**

A handout was distributed to provide general information on current DEP solid waste program staffing and grant resources. This information is not intended as an exact accounting of current DEP resources, but rather to inform background assumptions for the Master Plan review process. For this purpose, it is assumed that current funding and staffing levels will remain roughly the same for the remainder of the Master Plan time period.

A participant suggested it would be helpful to also provide baseline staffing and grants funding numbers for comparison purposes. A comparison of FY02 and FY05 staffing and funding resources is attached at the end of these meeting notes.

*Note: All of the points summarized below reflect attendee comments made at the October 20, 2004 SWAC meeting. DEP has not yet formed any proposals for revising the Master Plan.*

**Capacity Issues and No Net Import/Export Policy**

**Points of General Agreement**

- Participants generally agreed that DEP should change the no net import/export policy to a long-term goal without a fixed date attached to it. It was suggested that it currently functions more like a goal than like a policy.
- There also was general agreement that it is important to have some form of increased in-state management capacity to allow for more options to manage Massachusetts waste. This capacity could take the form of reducing waste generation, recycling or composting capacity, or transfer or disposal capacity.
  - Increased in-state management capacity would help to reduce waste management costs for municipalities and businesses.

**Points of Disagreement**

- **No Net Import/Export as Tool to Encourage Waste Reduction**
  - Some participants suggested that, while DEP should focus on encouraging additional recycling and composting capacity, constraining capacity through no net import/export is not a productive way to do this. Instead, waste management systems are economically driven and the industry cannot turn capacity on and off in response to government policy changes. Since DEP does not directly develop capacity itself, it needs to rely on a broader more integrated package of policy and

program tools to be effective at increasing waste reduction and diversion capacity and ensuring sufficient capacity to meet in-state need.

- Other participants stated that the no net import/export goal does encourage more diversion and should be considered an important part of the Commonwealth's waste reduction strategy.
- **Combustion Facility Moratorium and Other Waste Management Technologies**
  - Some participants argued that Massachusetts should not restrict capacity based on type of technology, as long as it is environmentally safe and meets siting and permitting requirements. Therefore, these participants stated that DEP should lift the combustion facility moratorium. It was also argued that DEP should lift the moratorium on combustion facilities because it limits management options for towns and increases their costs.
  - It was also suggested that capacity constraints may discourage development of other waste management technologies in Massachusetts that require a certain economy of scale to be cost-effective
  - Other participants stated that the combustion facility moratorium should continue based on environmental and public health risks, in particular related to mercury emissions and climate change.
- **Role of Local Governments and Residents in Facility Siting**
  - Some participants felt that members of the public should have additional opportunities to comment on proposed facilities; others commented that there is ample time for public comment built into existing site assignment and permitting processes.
  - It was suggested that advocates concerned about specific facilities should also weigh in on broader policy issues that may contribute to providing alternatives for needed management capacity.
  - An alternative approach was suggested in which local governments would plan for local or regional waste management needs and take greater responsibility for ensuring that needed facilities get sited.

#### **Other Comments**

- Since waste flows are managed on a regional basis, DEP should consider capacity planning on a regional basis, as opposed to for Massachusetts only.
- Facility siting and permitting requirements have a greater effect on limiting capacity than the no net import/export policy does.
- In analyzing capacity needs and demands, DEP should include capacity for managing combustion facility ash.

#### **Waste Reduction Strategies**

##### **Points of Agreement**

- **Increased Education and Technical Assistance:** A number of participants suggested that DEP should increase education for residents and technical assistance to municipalities. One suggested example was sign advertising on hauler trucks as a way to increase outreach.
- **Increase Business Recycling:** Many small businesses do not recycle paper and cardboard, and DEP should consider requiring businesses to recycle. One suggestion was

to require recycling by all businesses above a certain size. Another suggestion was to require recycling by all businesses, since many small businesses do not seem to be recycling.

- **Promoting PAYT:** DEP should increase the resources it devotes to promoting PAYT programs. A question was raised about whether PAYT (and other initiatives that increase fees for residents) leads to increased illegal dumping. A municipal participant from a town with PAYT stated that this is not the case.
- **Product Stewardship:** Several participants suggested that DEP further explore opportunities for increased product stewardship initiatives. It was pointed out that California has established several recent producer responsibility initiatives and that Massachusetts may be able to accomplish more in this area. Specific suggestions included:
  - Massachusetts should pass the mercury products bill that has been passed in other Northeast states.
  - There is a meeting on November 9<sup>th</sup> at MIT on proposed Massachusetts legislation on electronics product stewardship. This meeting will include electronics manufacturers in an attempt to revise legislation that could pass in Massachusetts.
  - DEP may be able to establish voluntary pilot projects with individual companies to focus on front-end solutions, such as changing how products are designed, packaged, and sold.

### **Points of Disagreement**

Although there was not complete agreement among attendees on waste reduction strategies, there were no clear areas of disagreement raised.

### **Other Comments**

- In gathering input on waste reduction strategies, DEP should clarify the scope of waste reduction. For the purpose of calculating the Massachusetts waste reduction rate, this includes:
  - Source reduction (measured indirectly by comparing actual generation to potential generation using economic indicators)
  - Recycling and composting
  - Other diversion (e.g., wood for fuel, C&D fines, residuals for grading and shaping)

### **Meeting Handouts and Presentations**

- Meeting Agenda and Discussion Questions
- Summary Notes from the October 6, 2004 SWAC Meeting
- Planning Assumptions for DEP Resources – October 20, 2004

### **Next SWAC SWMP Review Meeting**

The next SWAC SWMP Review Meeting is scheduled for Thursday November 4, 2004, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. at DEP, One Winter Street, Boston, MA.

**Solid Waste Master Plan Review**  
**Planning Assumptions for DEP Resources**  
**Comparison of FY02 and FY05 Solid Waste Program Staffing and Grants**  
**October 2004**

	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>
<b>Staff Levels (FTEs)</b>		
Regional Solid Waste Compliance & Enforcement, Permitting, Assistance	26.5	22
Regional Recycling Coordinators: Technical Assistance (TA)	4	3
Business Compliance: Regulations, Policy Development, BUD Review	3.5	3.5
Waste Planning: Master Plan, SWAC, Solid Waste/Recycling Data	5	2.5
Waste Reduction: TA, Training, Info. Dissemination, Grant Mgmt.	17	11
<b>TOTAL (25 % reduction)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Grant Funding (\$)</b>		
Redemption Center Grants	\$1,400,000	\$1,375,000
Direct Municipal Grants	\$7,300,000	\$300,000
In-Kind TA Grants	\$400,000	\$300,000
Recycling Industry Grants	\$950,000	\$75,000
Statewide Outreach and Partnerships (Consulting Services)	\$2,250,000	\$75,000
<b>TOTAL (83% reduction)</b>	<b>12,300,000</b>	<b>\$2,150,000</b>